

<p>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</p>	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; padding: 2px;"> Application No. 10/566,327 </td> <td style="width: 50%; padding: 2px;"> Applicant(s) OGAWA ET AL. </td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 2px;"> Examiner JASON MANDEVILLE </td> <td style="padding: 2px;"> Art Unit 2629 </td> </tr> </table>	Application No. 10/566,327	Applicant(s) OGAWA ET AL.	Examiner JASON MANDEVILLE	Art Unit 2629
Application No. 10/566,327	Applicant(s) OGAWA ET AL.				
Examiner JASON MANDEVILLE	Art Unit 2629				

All Participants:

(1) JASON MANDEVILLE.

(2) Lawrence Ashery.

Date of Interview: 13 June 2011

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Status of Application: Request for Continued Exam.

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: 12 PM

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

35 USC 103(a)

Claims discussed:

1

Prior art documents discussed:

Kashio et al. (US 7,218,292) and Nakamura (US 2002 / 0021264)

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Jason Mandeville/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2629

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner proposed a number claim amendments regarding the specific features of Figures 4 and 5 of the applicant's disclosure that could potentially overcome the prior art rejections of the previous Office Action. The examiner also directed the applicant's representative to the Kashio reference and provided rationale for the proposed claim amendments. The applicant's representative agreed that the proposed claim amendments could further prosecution..